REMARKS

I. Status of the Claims

Reconsideration and allowance of the claims pending in the application are requested.

Claims 1-8, 16-19 and 52-74 are pending in the application. Claims 52-55 have been withdrawn from consideration based on the Restriction Requirement set by the Examiner. Claims 1-8, 16-19 and 56-74 stand rejected as follows:

Claims 1-8, 16-19 and 56-74 were rejected under 35 U.S.C.§ 103(a) as being anticipated over Phillipsson (US 2001/0007815), hereinafter "Phillipsson" in view of Irvin (US 6,297,737), hereinafter "Irwin".

II. Response to Rejection Under 35 U.S.C.§ 103(a)

1. Applicants respond to the rejection of independent claims 1, 56, 62, 68, as follows:

A. Claim 1:

c) in response to detecting the presence of the RF-ID interrogation signal, providing a notification to activate a processor in the second terminal, the processor using the notification for setting a short-range communication module in the second terminal into a predefined operation mode for detecting paging signals directed to the second terminal;

The Examiner acknowledges that Phillipsson does not disclose the subject matter of feature (c), but contends that Irwin at column 6, lines 21-27 discloses providing a notification to activate a processor in the second terminal to set a short range communication module into a predefined operation for detecting paging signals. Applicants disagree.

First, the pending claim reads on "in response to detecting an RF-ID interrogation signal...". Irwin (US 6,297,737) does not relate to that aspect as Irwin (US 6,297,737) teaches aspects relating to Bluetooth communication.

Second, the Irwin reference (US 6,297,737) clearly teaches that the second terminal provides a return signal to the first terminal, as stated in Irwin at column 6, lines 25-26. In contrast, Applicants clearly disclose that the notification is provided within the second

terminal so that the processor of the second terminal, in response of detecting an RF-ID interrogation signal, can instruct the short-range communication module to enter page scan mode for providing means for the second terminal to respond to received paging messages.

Summarizing, Irwin fails to supply the missing feature in Phillipsson. Moreover, a return signal to the first terminal in Irwin does not equate to generating in the second terminal a notification to a processor in the second terminal to enter into a page scanning mode, as described in applicants specification at page 38, lines 2-7.

d) responding to the RF-ID interrogation signal by transmitting a RF-ID response signal to the first terminal including identification information relating to the short-range communication module of the second terminal;

The Examiner contends that Phillipsson at Paragraphs 20 and 23 disclose the subject matter of feature (d). The cited Paragraphs describe the second terminal providing a unique identification number for the terminal. However, there is no disclosure in Phillipsson relating to the second terminal providing identification information relating to the short range communication module of the second terminal, as described in Applicants' specification at page 16, lines 8-23.

e) processing the received RF-ID response signal by the first terminal to activate a short-range communication module in the first terminal to initiate a shortened session setup by transmitting a short-range paging signal directed to the second terminal based on information of the received RF-ID response signal to establish a short-range connection with the second terminal; and

The Examiner contends that Phillipsson at Paragraph 0025 discloses the subject matter of feature (e). Paragraph 0025 discloses the sale or first terminal establishes a connection with the pay or second terminal via a first short-range radio link. There is no disclosure in Paragraph 0025 of the first terminal establishing a connection with second terminal via a shortened session setup, as described in Applicants' specification at page 15, lines 15-23.

f) detecting the paging signal by the short-range communication module in the second terminal for immediate establishment of a short-range connection between the first and second terminals.

The Examiner contends that Phillipsson at Paragraph 0025 discloses the subject matter of feature (f). Paragraph 0025 discloses establishing a normal Bluetooth connection after an inquiry operation, and fails to disclose the immediate establishment of a short-range connection between the first and second terminals by skipping the inquiry step, as described in Applicants' specification at page 15, line 18 continuing to page 16, line 15.

Summarizing, Phillipsson and Irwin, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the subject matter of features (c) – (f), for the reasons previously indicated. The rejection of claim 1 is without support in the cited prior art. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC § 103(a) and allowance thereof are requested.

B. Claim 56:

b) responding to the RF-ID interrogation signal by transmitting a RF-ID response signal including identification information relating to a wireless short-range module of the terminal and providing a notification signal to a processor in the wireless communication terminal; and

The Examiner contends that Phillipsson at Paragraphs 20 and 22 discloses the subject matter of feature (b). Phillipsson fails to disclose the subject matter of feature (b) for the same reasons indicated in connection with the consideration of the corresponding feature in claim 1.

c) in response to the notification signal, activating the processor to instruct a wireless short-range communication module in the wireless communication terminal to enter into a predefined shortened session set-up operation mode for detecting paging signals.

The Examiner contends that Phillipsson at Paragraph 22 discloses the subject matter of feature (c). Phillipsson fails to disclose the subject matter of feature (c) for the same reasons indicated in connection with the consideration of the corresponding feature in claim 1.

Summarizing, Phillipsson and Irwin, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the subject matter of features (b) – (c), for the reasons previously indicated. The rejection of claim 56 is without support in the cited prior art. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 56 under 35 USC § 103(a) and allowance thereof are requested

C. Claim 62:

c) a near field communication module configured to detect a RF-ID interrogation signal and send a response signal including identification information relating to the wireless short-range communicant module, the wireless near field communication module further configured to provide to the processor a notification of the interrogation signal of the presence of the RF-ID interrogation signal, and

Applicants direct the Examiner's attention to the underlined portion of feature (c) which was added by amendment in the response filed April 2, 2007. The Examiner has not considered the above underlined portion in the current Office Action, dated June 11, 2007. Even if the underlined portion was considered by the Examiner, the references (Phillipsson and Irwin) fail to disclose or suggest a second terminal notifying the processor in the second terminal of an interrogation signal from the first terminal. for the reasons previously indicated in the consideration of the corresponding feature in claim 1.

wherein the processor is configured to instruct the wireless short range-communication module to enter into a predefined operation mode for detecting paging signals to establish a wireless short-range communication connection in response to receiving the notification from the near field communication module.

The Examiner contends Phillipsson at Paragraph 0022 discloses the preceding claimed feature. Paragraph 0022 discloses a passive transponder generating a response signal to an interrogation signal. There is no disclosure in Paragraph 0022 relating to the passive transponder being set into a predefined mode to detect paging signal, as described in applicants' specification at page 15, line 18 continuing to page 16, line 15. Phillipsson fails to disclose or suggest the subject matter of the above claimed feature.

Summarizing, Phillipsson and Irwin, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the subject matter of features (c), for the reasons previously indicated. The rejection of claim 62 is without support in the cited prior art. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 62 under 35 USC § 103 (a) and allowance thereof are requested

D. Claim 68:

a) a computer readable medium, executable in a computer system and storing:

i) program code for detecting a RF-ID interrogation signal and generating in a wireless communication terminal a notification of the RF-ID interrogation signal; and

The Examiner contends that Phillipsson at Paragraph 007, lines 3-4 discloses the claimed subject matter of feature (i). Paragraph 007 discloses a transponder in a mobile terminal receiving an interrogation signal from a stationary unit and generating a respond signal to the stationary unit. There is no disclosure or suggestion in Paragraph 007 of the transponder generating in the mobile terminal a notification of an interrogation signal.

ii) program code for providing the notification to activate a processor in the terminal, the processor using the notification to instruct a wireless short-range communication module to enter into a predefined operation mode for detecting paging signals.

The Examiner acknowledges that Phillipsson does not describe a notification in the wireless communication terminal, but contends that Irwin at column 6, lines 21-27 discloses a respond signal generated by a tag, the respond signal serving as a response to mobile terminal and a notification to a processor in the tag. However, there is no disclosure in Irwin at the cited text of a processor in the tag. Even assuming a processor in the tag, there is no disclosure in Irwin or Phillipsson to instruct a communication module in the tag to detect paging signals, as described in Applicants' specification at page 15, line 18 continuing to page 16, line 15.

Summarizing, Phillipsson and Irwin, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the subject matter of features (i) and (ii), for the reasons previously indicated. The rejection of claim 68 is without support in the cited prior art. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 68 under 35 USC § 103(a) and allowance thereof are requested

2. Applicants respond to the rejection of dependent claims 2-7; 16-19; 57-61; 62-67 and 69 -74 under 35 U.S.C.§ 103(a), as follows:

Claim 2:

The Examiner contends that Paragraph 0025 in Phillipsson discloses the subject matter of claim 2. Applicants can find no disclosure in Paragraph 0025, nor has the Examiner identified any text in Paragraph 0025 relating to a RF-ID tag reader, having tag functionality and terminal identification information, as described in the subject application at page 22, lines 3-16. Phillipsson fails to disclose the subject matter of claim 2.

Claim 3:

The Examiner contends that Paragraph 0028 in Phillipsson discloses the subject matter of claim 3. Paragraph 0028 discloses embodiments of passive transponders. Applicants can find no disclosure in Paragraph 0028, nor has the Examiner identified any text in Paragraph 0028, where a RF-ID tag reader is switched from a tag reader state to a tag state, as described in the subject application at page 28, lines 9-22. Phillipsson fails to disclose the subject matter of claim 3.

Claim 4:

The Examiner contends that Paragraph 0022 in Phillipsson discloses the subject matter of claim 4. Paragraph 0022 describes the second or active terminal establishes a connection with the first or passive terminal. Applicants can find no disclosure in Paragraph 0022, where the first and second terminals include RF-ID tag readers which may operate in an active mode. Phillipsson fails to disclose the subject matter of claim 4.

Claims 5 and 6:

The Examiner contends that Paragraph 0028 in Phillipsson discloses the subject matter of claim 5 and 24. Paragraph 0028 discloses embodiments of passive transponders. Applicants can find no disclosure in Paragraph 0028 nor has the Examiner identified any text in Paragraph 0028 relating to the second or sale terminal wherein RF-ID tag readers operate in a powered down state and passive mode, as described in the application at page 39, lines 1-10. Phillipsson fails to disclose the subject matter of claims 5 and 6.

Claim 7:

Claim 7 depends from claim 1 and is patentable over Phillipsson on the same basis as claim 1.

Claim 8:

The Examiner contends that Paragraph 0016 in Phillipsson discloses the subject matter of claim 8. Paragraph 0016 discloses a Bluetooth link is established between a first or pay terminal and a second or sale terminal. Applicants can find no disclosure in Paragraph 0016, nor has the Examiner identified any text in Paragraph 0016, wherein, the second terminal informs the Bluetooth module to enter into a page scan mode to provide a shortened device discovery and session setup with a first terminal. Phillipsson fails to disclose the subject matter of claim 8.

Claim 16:

The Examiner contends Paragraph 0027 in Phillipsson discloses the claimed feature. Paragraph 0027 discloses the first terminal may be a mobile communication device, whereas, the second terminal maybe another kind of stationary unit. In contrast, applicants disclose both the first and second devices may be mobile devices as shown and described in Figure 9. Phillipsson fails to disclose the subject matter of claim 16.

Claim 17:

The Examiner contends Paragraph 0005 in Phillipsson discloses the claimed feature. Paragraph 0005 discloses establishing a short-range radio link between stationary unit and a mobile communication device for transactions in a wireless network. Applicant can find no disclosure in Paragraph 005, nor has the Examiner identified any text in Paragraph 0005, for determining the acceptability of a short-range connection, as described in the application at page 9, lines 3-7. Phillipsson fails to disclose the subject matter of claim 17.

Claim 18:

The Examiner contends Paragraph 0016 in Phillipsson discloses the claimed feature. Paragraph 0016 discloses the establishment of a first short range radio link between a first or pay terminal and a second or sale terminal. Applicants can find no disclosure in Paragraph 0016 relating to entering into a page scanning mode, if a Bluetooth mode is acceptable, as described in the subject application at page 9, lines 5-8. Phillipsson fails to disclose the subject matter of claim 18.

Claim 19:

The Examiner contends Paragraph 0028 in Phillipsson discloses the claimed feature. Paragraph 0028 discloses passive transponders for incorporation into the first terminal. Applicants can find no disclosure in Paragraph 0028, nor has the Examiner identified any text in Paragraph 0028, relating to a first terminal entering into a non-connectable mode if a Bluetooth mode is not acceptable, as described in the subject application at page 9, lines 4-5. Phillipsson fails to disclose the subject matter of claim 19.

Claims 57 and 63:

Claims 57 and 63 depend from and further limit claims 56 and 62 , respectively and are patentable over Phillipsson on the same basis as the independent claim from which they depend.

Claims 58 and 64:

The Examiner contends that Phillipsson at Paragraph 0016 discloses the claimed subject matter of claims 56 and 64. Paragraph 0016 describes a pay terminal 10; a sale terminal 12 and a Bluetooth link. Applicants can find no disclosure in Phillipsson at Paragraph 0016 relating to the claimed subject matter including a Bluetooth serial number and clock-offset information. Phillipsson fails to disclose the subject matter of claims 57 and 63.

Claims 59, 65 and 69:

The Examiner contends Phillipsson at Paragraph 0016 discloses the subject matter of claims 59, 65 and 69. Applicants can find no disclosure in Phillipsson at Paragraph 0016 relating to entering into a page scan mode after detecting an interrogation signal. Phillipsson fails to disclose the subject matter of claims 57 and 63.

Claims 60, 66 and 70:

The Examiner contends that Phillipsson at Paragraph 0022 discloses the claimed subject matter. Paragraph 0022 discloses a passive frequency transponder. Applicants can find no disclosure in Paragraph 0022 or elsewhere in Phillipsson relating to a paging signal as an initial signal to activate a wireless short range communication module. Phillipsson fails to disclose the subject matter of claims 60, 66 and 70.

Claims 61, 67 and 71:

The Examiner contends that Phillipsson at Paragraphs 20 and 25 describes the subject matter of claims 61, 67 and 71. The cited Paragraphs describe establishing Bluetooth connection without skipping an inquiry stage. Phillipsson fails to disclose the subject matter of claims 61, 67 and 71.

Claim 72:

The Examiner contends that Irwin at column 5, lines 26-35 discloses the claimed subject matter. The cited disclosure provides references to Bluetooth papers without identifying any paper disclosing or suggesting a terminal enter into a page scanning mode if a notification in the terminal indicates a Bluetooth connection is acceptable. Phillipsson fails to disclose the subject matter of claim 72.

Claim 73:

The Examiner contends that Irwin at column 5, lines 26-35 discloses the claimed subject matter. The cited text does not describe or suggest a notification generated in a terminal

instructing the terminal to enter a into non-connectable mode. Phillipsson fails to disclose the subject matter of claim 73.

Claim 74:

Claim 74 depends from and further limits claim 1 and is patentable over the cited art on the same basis as claim 1.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have demonstrated that Phillipsson and Irwin, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest in a RF-ID environment (a) generating in a terminal a notification of an interrogation signal; (ii) notifying a processor in the terminal to set a short-range communication module in the terminal into a predefined operation mode; (iii) initiating a shortened session with another terminal by skipping an inquiry stage and entering a paging stage, and an RF-ID reader with tag functionality. The rejection of claims 1-8; 16-19 and 52-74 under 35 USC 102 (e) and 103 (a) is without support in Phillipsson and Irwin. Entry of the amendment; withdrawal of the rejection; allowance of the claims and passage to issue of the application are requested.

AUTHORIZATION

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for consideration of this Amendment to Deposit Account No. **13-4500**, Order No. 4208-4047US1.

In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No **13-4500**, Order No. 4208-4047US1.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: September 10, 2007

By: Joseph C. Redmond, Jr.

Joseph C. Redmond, Jr.

Registration No. 18,753

Correspondence Address:

Address Associated With Customer Number:

27123

(202) 857-7887 Telephone

(202) 857-7929 Facsimile